

OPINION 2131 (Case 3271)***Nematois australis* Heydenreich, 1851 (currently *Adela australis*; Insecta, Lepidoptera): given precedence over *Tinea aldrovandella* Villers, 1789**

Abstract. The Commission has ruled that the widely used specific name *Nematois australis* Heydenreich, 1851 is conserved for a common south European fairy moth (family ADELIDAE) by giving it precedence over the questionable senior synonym *Tinea aldrovandella* Villers, 1789. *T. aldrovandella* was not used after publication until 1980 when it was mentioned as a possible synonym of *A. australis*.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; ADELIDAE; *Adela australis*; *Tinea aldrovandella*; fairy moth; Europe.

Ruling

- (1) Under the plenary power it is ruled that the name *australis* Heydenreich, 1851, as published in the binomen *Nematois australis*, is hereby given precedence over the name *aldrovandella* Villers, 1789, as published in the binomen *Tinea aldrovandella*, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms.
- (2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
 - (a) *australis* Heydenreich, 1851, as published in the binomen *Nematois australis*, with the endorsement that it is to be given precedence over the name *aldrovandella* Villers, 1789, as published in the binomen *Tinea aldrovandella*, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms;
 - (b) *aldrovandella* Villers, 1789, as published in the binomen *Tinea aldrovandella*, with the endorsement that it is not to be given priority over the name *australis* Heydenreich, 1851, as published in the binomen *Nematois australis*, whenever the two are considered to be synonyms.

History of Case 3271

An application to conserve the widely used specific name *Nematois australis* Heydenreich, 1851 for a common south European fairy moth (family ADELIDAE) by giving it precedence over the questionable senior synonym *Tinea aldrovandella* Villers, 1789 was received from Mikhail V. Kozlov (*Section of Ecology, University of Turku, 20014 Turku, Finland*) and Erik J. van Nieuwerkerken (*National Museum of Natural History, Naturalis, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands*) on 20 February 2003. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 60: 290–292 (December 2003). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. A comment in support of the application was published in BZN 62: 29.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 March 2005 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 60: 291. At the close of the voting period on 1 June 2005 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes — 16: Alonso-Zarazaga, Bock, Brothers, Calder, Fortey, Halliday, Lamas, Macpherson, Mahnert, Mawatari, Minelli, Nielsen, Papp, Patterson, Rosenberg and van Tol.

Negative votes — 2: Bouchet and Štys.

No votes were received from Böhme, Kerzhner, Ng and Song.

Voting against, Bouchet commented: 'I sympathize with the intent of the application to discard the name *Tinea aldrovandella* Villers, 1789 because (1) the original description of *Tinea aldrovandella* is very vague, (2) there is no type material, and (3) the name had not been used at all until it was resurrected by Leraut (1980). However, I disagree with the technicalities of the proposal. The name *Nematois australis* Heydenreich, 1851 is obviously little used outside a small circle of fairy moths specialists, so usage is not in itself a reason compelling enough to reverse priority. Giving *Nematois australis* precedence over *Tinea aldrovandella* still leaves the latter an available name, and thus potentially a senior synonym of another European adelid fairy moth, as stated in the application (para. 2). I think the name *Tinea aldrovandella* Villers, 1789 should be suppressed'. Also voting against, Štys commented: 'a more elegant and definitive solution would have been to establish a neotype for *Tinea aldrovandella* Villers, 1789 in the sense of the holotype of *Nematois australis* Heydenreich, 1851 instead of the (probably non-existing) specimen represented by its illustration in Herrich-Schaeffer (1851). We learned nothing about the holotype of this nominal species in the application. Moreover, *Tinea aldrovandella* Villers, 1789 remains, unnecessarily, a nomen dubium'.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

aldrovandella, *Tinea*, Villers, 1789, *Caroli Linnaei Entomologia, Fauna Suecicae descriptionibus aucta; etc.*, p. 526.
australis, *Nematois*, Heydenreich, 1851, *Lepidopterorum Europaeorum Catalogus Methodicus*, p. 131.